

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 11-24, 35-39 and 42-46 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 11-24, 35-39 and 42-46 have been amended to remove the phrase "means." Claims 11-24 and 35-46 are pending.

Claims 11-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, it is asserted that the phrase an "intensity that is small on the periphery of the color region ... and large in the vicinity of the central portion of said region," in claims 11 and 12, is unclear. In addition, with respect to claim 11, the Examiner asserts that it is "unclear as to how information that is 'included in said pixel signal' can be other than 'pixel information.'" Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to clarify that a correction intensity is generated smaller on a periphery of a color region and larger in a vicinity of a central portion of the color region. Claim 11 has also been amended to clarify that a correction degree is set by using a) the pixel signal, b) the information of identifying the photographic scene and c) the target color. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 11-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 24 and 35-46 are allowed and that claims 11-23 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended accordingly. Thus, claims 11-23 are in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 10/527,661
Amendment Dated: April 28, 2009
Reply to Office Action of: February 2, 2009

MTS-3492US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

DMG/so

Dated: April 28, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

FP_404158